UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,671	03/09/2004	Keith Edward Foley	600.1263	3017

23280 7590 04/12/2006

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10018

EXAMINER	
HAMDAN, WASSEEM H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,671	FOLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wasseem H. Hamdan	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 20 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: claim 20 is directed to operating a plurality of devices at stations along a conveyor to create a first printed product configuration, the plurality of devices including at least a first feeder feeding a first printed product to the conveyor and a second feeder feeding a second printed product collected with the first printed product.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 20 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rabjohns (US Patent 5,592,881).

Regarding claims 1, Rabjohns discloses a method for detecting a type of one of a plurality of devices attached to a graphics machine [FIG. 2; column 1, lines 43-50; column 2,

lines 12-21], each device being one of at least a first type a second type [102; 106; 108], the method comprising:

detecting at a controller [200] whether the device attached to or to be attached to the machine is of the first, the second type [column 1, lines 34-38; column 5, lines 33-38], the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection [column 2, lines 42-50; column 5, lines 33-38].

Regarding claim 2, Rabjohns discloses wherein the device includes a type identifier, and an identifier reader can be connected to the controller [column 1, 53-55; column 2, lines 33-34].

Regarding claim 3, Rabjohns discloses wherein the controller sends a control signal to the device as a function of the detection [column 1, lines 54-59; column 5, lines 32-33].

Regarding claim 4, Rabjohns discloses wherein the devices can be added or removed and replaced with other devices of other types [column 1, lines 34-38; column 2, lines 36-43].

Regarding claim 5, Rabjohns discloses wherein the devices are feeders for a binding line [column 1, line 17; column 3, lines 41-43].

Regarding claim 6, Rabjohns discloses the devices are printing press components [102; 104; 106; 108].

Regarding claim 7, Rabjohns running a self-test check upon each turn-on of the machine to determine which devices are connected to the machine [column 1, lines 38-41; column 5, lines 32-39].

Regarding claim 8, Rabjohns discloses a graphics machine [FIG. 1; 101; 100] comprising:

a controller [200],

a first device [102] connected to the controller [102 or 104 is connected to 101 and 101 via the bus 202], the first device being categorizable as one of at least a first type a second type, the controller detecting whether the device is of the first type, the second type [FIG. 2; column 1, lines 43-50; column 2, lines 12-21]; and

a memory [column 6, line 22] accessible by the controller [200], the memory storing information regarding the first type and the second type [since Rabjohns discloses in column 6, line 22, that the controller has a memory, and also discloses in column 1, lines 34-50, that the controller has all the information about all the modules, therefore the module information captured and known by the controller];

wherein the controller automatically adjusts the first device as a function of the information [column 1, lines 42-50].

Regarding claim 9, Ueda et al. discloses wherein the first device includes a type identifier, and the machine further comprises an identifier reader connected to the controller [column 1, 53-55; column 2, lines 33-34].

Regarding claim 12, Rabjohns discloses wherein the first device is connected to the controller via an electrical plug, a fixed transmission line [102 or 104 is connected to 101 and 101 via the bus 202].

Regarding claim 13, Rabjohns discloses the graphics machine includes a second device [106] connected to the controller [106 is connected to 200 via the bus 202], the second device being one of the first type and the second type [column 3, lines 61-63].

Regarding claim 14, Rabjohns discloses wherein the first device is modular [column 3, lines 8-11].

Regarding claim 15, Rabjohns discloses wherein the controller has a plurality of inputs [05; 52; 28; 06; 83; 30], each input identifying a particular location of the machine [column 1, lines 38-59].

Regarding claim 19, Rabjohns discloses wherein the type identifier supplies a digital signal [column 6, lines 54-55].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns (US Patent 5,592,881) in view of Campbell et al. (US Patent 5,365,587).

Regarding claim 11, Rabjohns disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention except for wherein the information is stored as a table. Campbell et al. discloses wherein the information is stored as a table [313; 319; 325]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rabjohns by including the information is stored as a table, since having the information is stored as a table would be beneficial for the purpose of having a friendly user's system and easy to lookup information.

6. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns (US Patent 5,592,881) in view of Kikinis (US Patent 6,137,591).

Regarding claim 16, Rabjohns disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about that thetype identifier is a plug having an input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin. However Kikinis discloses wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin [Fig. 6; Fig. 8; column 9, lines 44-52]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rabjohns by including wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a

connection between the power pin and the other pin, since having wherein the type identifier is a plug having a input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal.

Regarding claim 17, Rabjohns disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor. However Kikinis discloses that the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor [189]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rabjohns by including the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor, since Kikinis teaches that having wherein the input power pin and the other pin are separated by a resistor would be beneficial for the purpose of regulating load to the power supply [Kikinis: column 9, lines 51-52].

Regarding claim 18, Rabjohns disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent about wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin. However Kikinis discloses wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin [Fig. 6; Fig. 8; column 9, lines 44-52]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

modify the teachings of Rabjohns by including wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin, since having wherein the at least one other pin includes two other pins, the type being determined by the presence or absence of power at the other pins when power is supplied to the input power pin would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal, and hence controlling the subsystems or modules.

7. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabjohns (US Patent 5,592,881) in view of Pepperl+Fuchs.

Please note with the broadest reasonable interpretation of claims 16-18 language, the examiner sees the benefit to show that it is very standard in the industry of testing or automation interface to have the pins as claimed in claims 16-18 as shown below the examination of claims 16-18 with another reference.

Regarding claims 16-18, Rabjohns disclose the essential elements of the claimed invention, but silent aboutthe limitations as claimed in claims 16-18. However Pepperl+Fuchs discloses the claimed limitations of claims 16-18 [page 12, Figure 5.3]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Rabjohns by including the limitations of 16-18 as above, since it would be beneficial for the purpose of connecting the two parts of the system through the connecting pins and hence having a specific pin for a specific data signal, and hence controlling the subsystems or modules.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wasseem H. Hamdan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2166. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (first Friday off) 6:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wasseem H. Hamdan

April 6, 2006

MINH CHAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER